

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the thoroughness with which the Examiner has examined the above-identified application. Reconsideration is requested in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

Specification Objections

The Examiner has stated that the disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the use of the trademark "i2 Demand Manager" has been noted in the application. Since "i2 Demand Manager" is used as a trademark, it should be noted as such wherever it appears, and accompanied by the generic terminology. Applicant concurs that the i2 Demand Manager designation appears to be used as a trademark. Without further investigation, applicant agrees to treat it as such. The "i2 DEMAND MANAGERTM" is an application that dynamically retrieves data from DB/2 databases.

A product/application called Demand Manager from i2 Technologies Corporation dynamically retrieves data from DB/2 databases for viewing by users. The i2 application simulates a multi-dimensional, hierarchical database, where the user must design and create each dimension and hierarchy based on a selected business process.
Specification, p.1, ll.23-26.

Applicant has altered the reference of this application to refer to it as a trademark, to wit: i2 DEMAND MANAGERTM. Applicant has further amended the claims to remove direct reference to the trademark, referring instead to generic terminology. No new matter has been added to the claims.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 14 because of a typographical error, to wit: "dimension table" should be changed to "dimension tables." Applicant concurs, and has made the requested change.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As to claims 1 and 18, the Examiner asserts that the claimed subject matter "i2 Demand Manager" is a trademark that is used as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product. Applicant has changed claims 1 and 18, and other dependent claims where appropriate, to refer to the i2 Demand Manager in its generic form as a database application.

The i2 Demand Manager is a browser-based application that lets a user view data, perform interactive forecasting, and conduct exception analysis for applications that require multi-dimensional analytical services. Specification, p.2, ll.19-21.

The Examiner has further rejected claim 11 due to the claimed subject matter DB/2, which is a trademark of the assignee, IBM Corporation. The DB/2 aliases may be, as the Examiner has indicated, any database in the open communication network other than DB/2. Applicants have amended claim 11 accordingly.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4 and 6-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Notani, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,533) in view of Mullins (U.S. Patent No. 6,999,956). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Notani teaches a computer-implemented system that enables a global user interface including a plurality of application engines and a visual information broker that has dynamically loadable adapters. The visual information broker operates as a middle tier to the plurality of application engines and the user interface process. It interfaces between the engine interface of an application engine and the user interface process by dynamically loading an adapter appropriate for that type of engine. Notani, col. 1, l.65-col. 2, l.6. Notani

does not teach or disclose building application databases that are then stored in configuration tables. The present invention teaches building persistence and measure databases, including creating SQL and generating a first set of programs to retrieve data from source systems. The persistence database contains metadata, including definitions of the database, level, level instances, scopes, sessions, security, and the like. The measure database contains the data for the specific intersections of each measure. Specification, p.4, ll.16-20.

The Examiner states that the use of Notani's engines 18 to build the core environment 10 teaches this function. Office Action, p.5. Notani's planning engines 18 comprise various domain engines that handle planning analysis and optimization across the supply chain. Notani, col.4, ll.6-9. Notani is silent regarding the construction of persistence and measure databases. Moreover, Notani requires an interface layer for data sources (supply chain link 14) and a dynamically loaded adapter (business object server 16) to interface the domain engines 18 to the data sources 12. Notani, Fig. 1. This represents a level of complexity not required in the instant invention.

The Examiner further states that Notani activates a second set of programs to read configuration tables, citing Notani, column 7, lines 21-25, and Fig. 6. Office Action, p.5. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The configuration tables referred to in claim 1 are those represented by the persistence and measure databases. The instant invention builds these tables, and then activates a second set of programs to read them. Notani does not teach, disclose, or suggest this operation. Notani's Fig. 6 is a block diagram of a business object server (BOS), which operates as a data server. Notani's business object server serves up objects to the engine from multiple different data sources. It does not create configuration tables, nor read from them. Moreover, applicant submits that Notani, column 7, lines 21-25 is not relevant to this claim limitation. This reference reads as follows:

Likewise, although not shown, if an application needs to embed an engine 92 into the application's user interface, then the application's user interface can make a call to visual information broker 94 which, in turn, interfaces to engine 92.

Notani, col. 7, ll.21-25.

Moreover, Notani is ambiguous as to whether the application's user must interact through the visual information broker to interface with the engine, or if this communication is done automatically. Notani's visual information broker interfaces to an inter-domain connectivity plane to obtain information from various sources and package that information into a common format. This reference appears to allow the Notani design to embed an engine, and does not teach reading a *self-generated* configuration table.

The Examiner states that Notani teaches generating control tables to control the loading, including determining which of the data measures are to be loaded and when the loading is to occur. Office Action, p.6, citing Notani, col. 4, ll.25-57. Applicant disagrees. Notani does not generate control tables; rather, pre-generated, dynamically loaded adapters are implemented by JAVABEANS™ or ACTIVEX user interface components. Nor does Notani teach or suggest determining which of the data measures are to be loaded and when the loading is to occur.

With respect to claim 14, the Examiner states correctly that neither Notani nor Mullins disclose dimension tables as claimed. However, the Examiner states that one of ordinary skill in the art could have created such tables through an SQL "create table" statement. Although tables in general are well known in the art, and there exists call statements to create them, neither prior art teaches, discloses, or suggests a suite of dimension tables that specifically include a master source table; a table holding views; a table holding hierarchy level information for each dimension; a table containing information to each level; a table containing information to each measure; a table holding lookup

information for location; a table holding information for level members; a table holding data for intersections of a database; and tables holding each process and each event of each process, as claimed in claim 14. Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art is completely silent regarding this specific dimension table configuration, and as such, combining table-creating capabilities with Notani or Mullins does not teach the present invention. A similar argument may be made to the measure configuration tables of claim 15, which specifically include: generating a master measure source table; holding dimensionality information for each of said measures; addressing level members; and generating measure data tables. The prior art is silent with respect to this detailed construction. The generation of programs to read the master measure source table and the dimensionality information, as claimed by claim 16, is also unique to the present invention. The Examiner suggests that a read instruction would suffice. Applicant disagrees. The present invention creates a program to read these tables, and automatically generates SQL for the tables. The implementation of the Examiner's suggested "read" command would not do this, nor does the cited prior art of Notani and Mullins teach, suggest, or disclose this operation.

It is respectfully submitted that the revisions to the application puts it in a condition where allowance of the entire case is proper. Reconsideration and issuance of a notice of allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,




Robert Curcio
Reg. No. 44,638

DeLIO & PETERSON, LLC
121 Whitney Avenue
New Haven, CT 06510-1241
(203) 787-0595

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 2231301450.

Name: Carol M. Thomas Date: August 24, 2006 Signature: 

ibmf100404000amdA